DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 435 608 SP 038 858

AUTHOR van der Westhuizen, Philip C.; Mosoge, M. J.
TITLE Teacher Deprivation in School Based Management in South Africa.
PUB DATE 1999-04-00
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Comparative and International Education Society (Toronto, Ontario, Canada, April 14-18, 1999).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; *Participative Decision Making; Principals; *School Based Management; Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Participation; *Teacher Role; Teachers
IDENTIFIERS South Africa

ABSTRACT

This study examined the extent of teacher participation in school management. Participants were 260 teachers and 40 principals from random samples of schools in each of three education districts in South Africa. Researchers administered a closed questionnaire that asked the teachers and principals to indicate their actual and desired participation in each of a list of management activities on a Likert-type scale. Some of the management activities included: creating the school budget, making a year-long plan of school activities, setting standards for teacher evaluation, orienting new students, setting conduct rules for teachers, recruiting new teachers, determining school goals and objectives, inducting new teachers, determining plans to meet school goals, guiding teachers who shared a subject/department team, and setting standards for amount of written work and tasks. The response rate to the survey was 74.6 percent for teachers and 95 percent for principals. According to the results, teachers reported participation deprivation across the board in all management activities. Teachers had a high level of deprivation on most of the activities and a medium level of deprivation on only four of the items. (Contains 30 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 435 608

# TEACHER DEPRIVATION IN SCHOOL BASED MANAGEMENT IN SOUTH AFRICA

**Philip C. van der Westhuizen***

**and**

**M.J. Mosoge**

**Graduate School of Education, Potchefstroom University , Potchefstroom 2520, Republic of South Africa**

**Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Comparative and International Education Society (CIES), Toronto, Canada, April 14-18, 1999**

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M.J Mosoge

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP038858

* To whom correspondence must be sent

## 1. Introduction

Subordinate participation in decision making has long been the basis of educational reform in such diverse countries as the USA (Hallinger, 1988; Pashiardis, 1994; Short, 1994; Perry, Brown & McIntire, 1994), Denmark, Tanzania, Mozambique (Harber, 1993) and Australia (Chapman, 1988). The dawn of a "new South Africa" has seen a proliferation of legislation specifying the participation of stakeholders in school governance and management. This, in turn, has presented principals, teachers, parents, and learners, long accustomed to authoritarian modes of management and having very little prior experience and theoretical grounding in the tenets of participatory management, with the daunting task of converting this new legislation into practical reality.

Against this backdrop the aim of this article is to report on the extent of teacher participation in school management. The selection of this aim was based on its apparent significance for implementation of results in schools.

## 2. Related research

The literature uses a plethora of concepts to define teacher access to decision making in schools, for example, sitebased management, school based management, shared decision making and empowerment (Walker & Roder, 1993). For purposes of this article the following explanation of terms was used:

"Teacher": includes any person who teaches, educates or trains learners at a a school but excludes a principal or headmaster of such a school;

"Access": way or means to take part in;

"Decision making: an action of taking decisions through which an organisation is regulated, governed and managed.

Taking the above explanation into account, the authors agree with Walker and Roder (1993:) who generalise the terms used in this connection as referring to "a system of involving teachers in the work which traditionally has been the preserve of principals". It is especially this shift in the school management paradigm that makes it imperative to conduct further investigation into the participation question.

Following the work of Alutto and Belasco (1972), the bulk of research on participation uses a discrepancy measure to compare actual and desired participation of respondents (cf. Rice & Schneider, 1994; Perry *et al.*, 1994; Pashiardis, 1994). In the main, these research studies found that teachers desire more participation than they presently have. Interestingly, in a replicated research conducted ten years after the first one, Rice and Schneider (1994) found that teachers still expressed deprivation especially in managerial issues though a narrowing of the gap between actual and desired participation was discernible.

Other studies investigated the influence which participants exert on the decision making process (Benson & Malone, 1987; Imber, Neidt & Reyes, 1990; Wright, 1980). Research along these lines still produced a pattern of perceived deprivation in managerial issues.

Wright (1980), for example, found that teachers perceived least influence in fiscal management, teaching assistants and personnel selection while Benson and Malone (1987) found deprivation in managerial issues and saturation in technical issues for both urban and suburban schools.

From the above studies it is clear that further research on the participation of teachers in the managerial domain remains crucial. Even though the literature uses a plethora of concepts to define participation in management, for example, site based management, school based management, shared decision making and empowerment (Walker & Roder, 1993), these terms generally refer to a system of involving teachers in the work which traditionally has been the preserve of principals. It is especially this shift in the school management paradigm that makes it imperative to conduct further investigation into the participation question.

The research studies mentioned above were conducted in developed countries which boast of a long history of democracy, and quite rightly, focused on teacher participation from the viewpoint of the teacher. Very few research studies have focused on developing countries which had little democratic participation of the populace. Harber's (1993) research is among the few conducted in a developing country with an emerging democracy, viz., Tanzania, but then, his emphasis was on pupil rather than teacher participation. In the RSA, most research in this direction has concentrated on team management (Mataboge, 1993; Dreyer, 1989). However, these research studies approached participation from the operative viewpoint of the principal and, typically, responses were elicited from principals rather than from teachers.

Consequently, the approach adopted in the research on which this article is based, incorporated both the perceptions of principals and teachers. It also sought explanations to their responses in the developing nature of their country and its paradigm shifts.

## 3. Research design

### 3.1 Instrumentation

A closed questionnaire, based on previous research instruments, viz., Teacher Participation and Involvement Scale (Russell, Cooper & Greenblatt, 1992), Shared Education Decisions Survey and Teacher Decision Making Instrument (Ferrara, 1993), was developed to suit the education system of the country of investigation. The question items were derived from the literature study and were clustered in accordance with the management tasks of planning, organising, leading and controlling (cf. Van der Westhuizen, 1997; Turney, 1992; Kroon, 1990).

Respondents were asked to indicate their actual and desired participation in each question item on a Likert type of scale with 4 points, where 1 indicated least actual participation and least desired participation while 4 showed most actual participation and most desired participation. While principals also responded to the same questionnaire, their task was to rate the participation of teachers.

### 3.2 Population and sampling method

A two-stage cluster sampling procedure was used to obtain representativity over the whole target population (Ary, Jacobs & Razavieh, 1990:179; Anderson, 1990:199; Fraenkel & Wallen, 1990:72). This technique consisted of selecting random samples of schools in each of the three education districts in Gauteng South Region and then randomly selecting participants from each school. The principal of the selected school was automatically included in the sample.

Of the 1012 teachers and 40 principals forming the target population, a sample of 260 teachers and 40 principals was involved in the survey. A response rate of 95% principals and 74,6% teachers was obtained.

Both the sample and the response rate provided reliable estimates of the opinions of the target population and a quantity of data large enough to make valid and reliable conclusions (Ary *et al.*, 1990:453; Anderson, 1990:167).

### 3.3 Statistical techniques

The mean scores for both principals and teachers were computed separately so that a comparison could be drawn between the responses of principals and teachers.

A paired *t*-test of the mean scores for actual and desired participation of the two samples was subsequently computed. The resultant score reflected a subtraction of the mean score of desired participation from the mean score of actual participation on each question item for each population sample. The paired *t*-test was applied in order to establish the state of participation of respondents according to three categories, viz., (Ferrara, 1993; Rice & Schneider, 1994):

* a **state of saturation**: desired participation is less than actual participation. This gives a plus score;
* a **state of equilibrium**: desired and actual participation mean scores are equal. This gives a zero score;
* a **state of deprivation**: the desired participation mean score is greater than the actual participation mean score. This gives a minus score.

The paired *t*-test was also used to find out whether the statistically significant differences were practically significant. Practical significance is indicated by the *d*-value (effect size) on the following criteria (Cohen, 1988):

* 0,15 = small effect
* 0,35 = medium effect
* 0,6 = great effect.

The test for practical significance was done in order to explore possibilities of implementing research results in the light of new educational legislation mentioned earlier.

## 4. Results and discussion

The results of the application of the paired *t*-test are shown in three tables (Tables 1, 2 and 3) which show teachers' and principals' mean scores. Since all the mean scores of both teachers and principals show a minus sign, indicating deprivation, the mean scores were then divided into high, medium and low deprivation (cf. Benson & Malone, 1987). The following criteria derived from the highest possible deprivation mean score (-1,5) were used:

High deprivation: -1,1 to -1,5
Medium deprivation: -0,6 to -1,0

Low deprivation: -0,1 to -0,5

### 4.1 Items showing high deprivation (Table 1)

Table 1 shows a ranking of items of high deprivation according to the teachers' mean scores while the principals' mean scores are not ranked but are reflected for comparison purposes.

According to Table 1 teachers feel the highest deprivation in three items while principals consider teachers to be highly deprived in four items, with only one item (Item 2.3) being common to both groups. The three first items according to the teachers' mean scores deserve special discussion.

*Item 2.7: Drawing up the school budget.* This item shows the highest deprivation (X=-1,411) among teachers and nearly achieves the highest possible score (-1,5) on the deprivation scale. This item is also statistically practically significant among the teachers ($p$=0,0001; $d$=1,040). The mean scores of principals, in contrast, indicate an item with the lowest deprivation (X=-0,555). However, as in the case of teachers, the item is statistically practically significant among principals ($p$=0,0204; $d$=0,602).

The finding that teachers feel deprived in financial matters, is consistent with previous research (Wright, 1980; Ferrara & Repa, 1993). The literature confirms that teachers in the RSA in the schools under investigation never participated in financial matters, this function being performed by the Governing Body in which teachers were not represented (DET, 1990). Unlike their White counterparts in the predominantly White schools, teachers in these schools did not have finance committees.

That the mean scores of principals reflect low deprivation is interesting in view of the literature finding mentioned above. This is indicative of the difference of opinion between teachers and principals. The literature reports an intense conflict over financial matters between principals, teachers and learners in the schools under investigation, to the extent that in some schools learners demanded back the funds they had paid into to the school coffers (DET, 1990). The response of principals may, therefore, indicate that they either fail to realise the importance of accessing teachers to financial matters in the school or they are reluctant to do so. It further shows that principals, on their own perceptions, would not have considered this item for inclusion in a programme of implementing participation.

Since in both groups the item shows $d$-values greater than 0,6 it means the item is significant for practical purposes and should be accorded the highest priority in any

programme of implementing teacher participation. From the principals' responses it is doubtful whether they would be keen to include this item in such a programme. However, implementors should be wary to change the principals' perceptions first before attempting implementation of the programme.

*Item 2.3: Drawing up a year programme of school activities.* An interesting feature in this item is that both among principals and teachers the item shows high deprivation with the principals' mean score (X=-1,263) being greater than the teachers' mean score (X=-1,168). Like the preceding item (Item 2.7), it is also practically significant among both groups (Teachers: $p$=0,0001; $d$=1,018; Principals: $p$=0,0002; $d$=1,057).

The reasons for this high deprivation on this item are hard to find because this activity falls within the purview of principals and teachers and nowhere along the line were these school members debarred from taking part in this activity.

A possible explanation may be that year plans in these schools are never drawn because the schools under investigation had been fields of the most intense conflicts during the liberation "struggle", leading to the adoption of crisis management where decisions are taken on a day-to-day basis without prior planning (cf. Mosoge, 1989). In any case, principals may have neglected this duty after repeatedly failing to implement their plans due to constant school disruptions.

However, the literature (Van der Westhuizen, 1997) also points to the fact that most managers neglect planning. Teachers cannot be expected to participate in an activity which is neglected by the managers themselves.

*Item 2.5: Effecting changes in the school policy.* Although according to the teachers' mean score this item rates high on deprivation (X=-1,113) and is both statistically and practically significant ($p$=0,0001; $d$=0,992); in sharp contrast, among principals it has a low mean score and is not statistically significant (X=-0,578; $p$=0,0698).

This serves to underline the importance of the teachers' opinions where their participation is concerned. Had only the opinions of principals being sought, this item would have not featured in the discussion nor in any envisaged programme of action on participation.

The reasons for the response of teachers emanates possibly from the fact that policy making in general has been handed top-down to schools in the recent past. The disagreement in the opinions of the teachers and the principals epitomises the conflicts surrounding policy making in the erstwhile RSA's education system for Blacks (Mosoge, 1989). In this conflict, teachers unequivocally demanded

participation in educational policy making (DET, 1990). In the new dispensation full participation of the stakeholders occurs regularly but the response of principals may indicate that this is an area where they may present difficulties to teacher access.

The difference of opinion between principals and teachers is further demonstrated in three items where principals' mean scores indicate high deprivation while the teachers themselves express medium deprivation.

*Item 2.18: Orientating new pupils.* Although among teachers the item is of medium deprivation (X =-1,057), it is relatively high on the deprivation scale. As for principals, the item rates as the highest (X =-1,368) on deprivation. This item falls within the ambit of the teacher's management work and thus it might have been expected that both principals and teachers would overwhelmingly indicate a point of saturation. Commonality between principals' and teachers' scores exist that the item is practically and statistically significant (Teachers: $p$=0,0001; $d$=0,898; Principals $p$=0,0001; $d$=1,129).

*Item 2.19: Determining inservice needs of teachers sharing your subject/department/team.* According to the principals' mean scores this is an item of high deprivation (X=-1,210) while the teachers' mean score rate it much lower (X=-0,983). In the two groups, however, the item is statistically practically significant (Teachers: $p$=0,0001; $d$=0,901; Principals: $p$=0,0003; $d$=1,023).

*Item 2.27: Evaluating the classroom practices of your colleagues.* This is yet another item in which principals' mean scores show a high deprivation activity (X=-1,157) while teachers' mean scores show a medium deprivation activity (X=-0,926). Like in the previous item, this item is also statistically practically significant among both groups (Teachers: $p$=0,0001; $d$=0,862; Principals: $p$=0,0019; $d$=0,385).

However, it must be said that while the above items would rate high on the priority list of principals in attempting to increase participation, teachers would regard these items as peripheral. In the same breath it may be pointed out that these items cannot be regarded as trivial from the teachers' viewpoint because the teachers' mean scores indicate that their deprivation in these activities gravitates towards high deprivation.

Item 2.27 is an interesting feature in that teachers' mean scores rate it lower than other items in this category even though it refers to teacher evaluation which shows relatively high deprivation means in all items in this category (see Table 2).

### 4.2 Items showing medium deprivation (Table 2)

Table 2 contains by far the greatest number of items which, in the opinions of teachers, are of medium deprivation. As can be seen from Table 2, of the listed items, ten lean towards high deprivation (greater than 0,8) while only six items are less than -0,7. The *p*-values indicate that all the listed activities are statistically practically significant and show great effect in both teachers' and principals' mean scores.

The above finding confirms previous research (cf. Benson & Malone, 1987; Perry *et al.*, 1994) that the pure states of equilibrium and saturation do not exist in practice and that teachers are highly deprived in all management activities.

The finding that all activities show great effect in both groups gains significance in terms of implementation of participation. It implies that implementation of teacher participation should not be haphazard but should be directed at increasing teacher participation on a priority basis according to the ranking of an activity on the deprivation scale. Agreement between the opinions of principals and teachers is applauded on the basis that implementation of participation will not be run aground by conflicting views of principals and teachers.

Instead of discussing each item separately, it appears more instructive to delve deeper into the reasons why so many management activities show medium deprivation. The above findings are to be expected in an emerging democracy like the RSA. Most of the reasons detailed under items of high deprivation also account for the medium deprivation items. Moreover, the population under consideration has for years been subjected to authoritarian modes of management whereby management activities were the preserve of the principal and higher education authorities. Respondents in this investigation are only beginning to practise participation on a wide front of political, economical and educational spheres.

Frequencies also indicate that most respondents (59,8%) belong to militant teacher unions which increases their desire to participate. About 65,9% of the respondents are males who, theoretically, desire more participation than females.

As indicated earlier, high deprivation is not characteristic of emerging democracies only. The reasons for high deprivation must therefore also partly lie with the way management is conceptualised. The functioning of a school is dichotomised into management work and operational work with teachers performing the operational work (technical work) and principals performing managing work. Hence in previous

research items were divided into managerial and technical domains. It is therefore difficult for principals to accept that teachers can share in managing work. Teachers also tend to accept this status quo (Conley, 1991) and may even be reluctant to accept responsibility and accountability for performing managing work. This probably accounts for Rice and Schneider's (1994) finding that after ten years of participation teachers still expressed deprivation.

However, with new approaches such as the Japanese management approach, it is accepted that the functioning of an organisation is a synergistic, cooperative teamwork between managers and workers. In the RSA democratic imperatives contained in new legislation forcefully bring home to principals and teachers that co-management with stakeholders is the best way to manage a school. Acceptance and practice of this management approach may still be the required tonic to increase teacher participation even in those countries with established democracies.

### 4.3 Items showing low deprivation (Table 3)

As displayed in Table 3, four items with low deprivation mean scores are common between principals and teachers. This finding can be ascribed to the fact that teachers, being directly involved and chiefly concerned with the management of pupils' activities (cf. Prinsloo & Van Rooyen, 1997), tend to be satisfied with their participation in activities where they exercise authority over learners.

Commonality of opinions, as indicated earlier, augurs well for the success of implementation of participation because a participation programme may be designed around these activities with the full knowledge that it will be acceptable to both teachers and principals. Notwithstanding this commonality of opinion, it should be pointed out that the low deprivation, coupled with the medium effect, in these items may be indicative of the fact that teacher participation in these activities is not crucial in a programme of implementation of participation. These activities may, therefore, be safely excluded from such a programme.

Much as commonality of opinion between principals and teachers is appreciated in terms of participation, diversity of opinion is unwelcome. The great difference of opinion here is underscored by items 2.5 and 2.7 (cf. Table 1) which are high deprivation items among teachers but are low deprivation items among principals. Furthermore, three more items (Items 2.10; 2.11; 2.17) (cf. Table 2) among principals show low deprivation but medium deprivation among teachers. It must be added that the latter three items, like item 2.5, were not even statistically practically significant among principals. Principals should be having sufficient reason to differ

so much from the teachers.

The literature (DET, 1990; Oosthuizen, 1994) reveals the view that duties such as planning and integration, year planning, delegation of duties to staff members and teacher evaluations, may not be delegated as they require high managerial responsibility and are central to the effectiveness of the school.

This view could have influenced principals to be reluctant to relinquish these duties on the grounds that an ineffective school may reflect badly on their competence as principals. It may also be possible that principals entertain the opinion that teachers are not competent or experienced enough to deal with these activities.

## 5. Summary and conclusion

The major finding of this study, that teachers report participation deprivation across the board in all management activities, concurs with previous research. Significantly, however, the research was conducted in an emergent democracy but produces similar findings to previous research which, in contrast, was carried out in established democracies. This serves to apprise practitioners that the exercise of participation in the political sphere does not guarantee its transference to other institutions, particularly, educational institutions. Thus, specific programmes should be implemented to bring participation to fruition in schools.

Most items among teachers in this research showed great effect with only four items showing medium effect. Although some items were not statistically practically significant among principals, most items which were, also showed great effect with only three having medium effect. Consequently, those management activities which showed great effect among principals and teachers need to be included in a programme aimed at implementing participation. A gradualist strategy may be adopted whereby items which showed the greatest deprivation would first receive attention to capture the interest of teachers and then gradually change the focus to medium effect items to sustain and complete participation.

The exploratory findings in this research indicate that a balance should be struck between the opinions of principals and teachers. As found in many instances in this research, principals and teachers share a common view concerning high and medium deprivation areas among teachers. This shared vision increases prospects of reducing conflict between these focal groups in the school.

In the final analysis, the principal and staff have to grapple daily with the implementation of policies regarding participation. Their success augurs well for the

transference of a participative culture to other stakeholders such as parents and learners.

In conclusion, it remains to be said that participation is an attitudinal matter and thus, political rhetoric and legislation can never ensure its success. Undoubtedly authoritarian modes and individualistic approaches to management are entrenched behaviour patterns in the RSA and in many other countries. To change this mind-set requires a sustained programme of changing the attitudes of principals, teachers, parents and learners towards a school management paradigm which is grounded on democratic values. Certainly, all indications point to the fact that participation is not just another passing fancy; it is deeply rooted in human nature and is probably a basic human drive.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**


ALLUTO JA & BELASCO JA 1972. A typology for participation in organizational decision making. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17(1):117-125.

ANDERSON G 1990. *Fundamentals of educational research*. London: Falmer Press.

ARY D, JACOBS LC & RAZAVIEH A 1990. *Introduction to research in education*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

BENSON M & MALONE P 1987. Teacher's beliefs about shared decision making and work alienation. *Education*, 107(13):244-251.

CHAPMAN JD 1988. Decentralization devolution and the teacher: participation by teachers in the decision making of schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 26(1):39-71.

COHEN J 1988. *Statistical power analysis for behavioral sciences*. Hillside NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

CONLEY SC 1991. Review of research on teacher participation in school decision making. In: Grant, G. (ed.) *Review of research in education*. Washington: American Research Association, p. 225-266.

DET
see
SOUTH AFRICA. Department of Education and Training.

DREYER RPM 1989. *'n Spanbestuurbenadering*. M.Ed.-skripsie, Potchefstroomse Universiteit vir CHO, Potchefstroom.

FERRARA DL & REPA JT 1993. Measuring shared decision making. *Educational Leadership*, 51(2):71-72.

FERRARA DL 1993. *Shared education decision survey*. New York: SEDS.

FRAENKEL JR & WALLEN NE 1990. *How to design and evaluate research in education*. New York: MacGraw-Hill.

HALLINGER PRD 1988. Models of shared leadership: envolving structures and relationships. Paper presented at the *Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association*, New Orleans, Los Angeles, 5-9 April.

HARBER C 1993. Democratic management and school effectiveness in Africa: learning from Tanzania. *Compare*, 23(3):289-300.

IMBER M, NEIDT WA & REYES P 1990. Factors contributing to teacher satisfaction with participative decision making. *Journal of Research and Development*, 23(4):216-225.

KROON J 1990. Bestuur en bestuurder. In: Kroon, J. (red.) *Algemene Bestuur*. Pretoria: Haum, p. 3-24.

MATABOGE SM 1993. Team management: a dynamic problem solving approach. Ph.D. Thesis, Vista University, Soweto.

MOSOGE MJ 1989. Conflict management as a task of the principal in the D:E.T. with special reference to the Vaal Triangle. M.Ed. Dissertation, Potchefstroom University for CHE, Potchefstroom.

OOSTHUIZEN JJ 1994. Personnel management. In: Oosthuizen JJ (ed.) *Aspects of educational law for educational management*. Pretoria: Van Schaik, p. 119-134.

PASHIARDIS P 1994. Teacher participation in decision making. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 8(5):14-17.

PERRY CM, BROWN DW & McINTIRE WG 1994. Teachers respond to the shared decision making opportunity. *Education*, 4(114):605-608.

PRINSLOO NP & VAN ROOYEN JW 1997. The management of pupil activities. In: Van der Westhuizen PC (ed.) *Effective educational management*. Pretoria: Kagiso, p.347-368.

RICE EL & SCHNEIDER GT 1994. A decade of teacher empowerment: an empirical analysis of teacher involvement in decision making, 1980-1991. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 32(1):43-58.

RUSSELL JJ, COOPER BS & GREENBLATT RB 1992. *Teacher involvement and participation scale*. Version 2. New York.

SHORT PM 1994. Defining teacher empowerment. *Education*, 4(114):493-502.

SOUTH AFRICA. Department of Education. 1990. Reply to demands submitted to the Department by teachers between 5 February and 23 March 1990.

*Information Bulletin*, Pretoria.

TURNEY C 1992. Conceptualising the management process. In: Turney C, Hatton N, Laws K, Sinclair, & Smith D. *The School Manager*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin, p.92-106.

VAN DER WESTHUIZEN PC 1997. Perspectives on educational management and explanation of terms. In: Van der Westhuizen, P.C. (ed.) *Effective educational management*. Pretoria: Kagiso, p.63-161.

WALKER PA & RODER L 1993. Reflections on the practical and legal implications of school-based management and teacher empowerment. *Journal of Law and Education*, 22(2):159-175.

WRIGHT DP 1980. *Teachers' perceptions of their own influence over school policies and decisions*. Los Angeles: EDRS

# TABLE 1: ITEMS SHOWING HIGH DEPRIVATION

| | | Teachers | | | | Principals | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Item** | **Management activities** | **x** | **p** | **d** | **.** | **x** | **p** | **d** | **.** |
| 2.7 | Drawing up the school budget | -1,411 | 0,0001+ | 1,040 | * * * | -0,555 | 0,0204 | 0,602 | * * * |
| 2.3 | Drawing up a year plan of school activities | -1,168 | 0,0001+ | 1,018 | * * * | -1,263 | 0,0002+ | 1,057 | * * * |
| 2.5 | Effecting changes in the school policy | -1,113 | 0,0001+ | 0,992 | * * * | -0,578 | 0,0698 | | * * * |
| 2.9 | Setting standards for teacher evaluation | -1,073 | 0,0001+ | 0,806 | * * * | -1,052 | 0,0020 | 0,829 | * * * |
| 2.18 | Orientating new pupils | -1,057 | 0,0001+ | 0,898 | * * * | -1,368 | 0,0001 | 1,129 | * * * |
| 2.19 | Determining inservice needs of teachers sharing your subject/department/team | -0,983 | 0,0001+ | 0,901 | * * * | -1,210 | 0,0003 | 1,023 | * * * |
| 2.27 | Evaluating the classroom practices of your colleagues | -0,926 | 0,0001+ | 0,862 | * * * | -1,157 | 0,0019 | 0,385 | * * |

+ Statistically significant at 0,05 X = Mean score
* Effect size: 0,35 - medium effect ** p = p-value; d = d-value
0,6 = great effect ***

## TABLE 2: ITEMS SHOWING MEDIUM DEPRIVATION

| | | Teachers | | | | Principals | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Item** | **Management activities** | **x** | **p** | **d** | **.** | **x** | **p** | **d** | **.** |
| 2.4 | Setting conduct rules for teachers | -1,062 | 0,0001 | 0,925 | * * * | -0,736 | 0,0000 | 0,670 | * * * |
| 2.24 | Determining how well the school goals and objectives are being met | -1,039 | 0,0001 | 1,084 | * * * | -0,789 | 0,0037 | 0,765 | * * * |
| 2.14 | Setting agenda items for meetings | -1,028 | 0,0001 | 0,950 | * * * | -0,842 | 0,0092 | 0,669 | * * * |
| 2.16 | Recruiting new teachers | -1,027 | 0,0001 | 0,931 | * * * | -0,368 | 0,2470 | | |
| 2.10 | Allocating subjects to teachers | -0,976 | 0,0001 | 0,839 | * * * | -0,105 | 0,6499 | | |
| 2.22 | Disseminating information conderning the school to parents, civic and other bodies | -0,971 | 0,0001 | 0,942 | * * * | -0,789 | 0,0024 | 0,808 | * * * |
| 2.26 | Evaluating the teaching performance of your colleagues | -0,938 | 0,0001 | 0,895 | * * * | -0,947 | 0,0083 | 0,679 | * * * |
| 2.15 | Liaising with parents, civic and outside bodies | -0,909 | 0,0001 | 0,821 | * * * | -0,736 | 0,0009 | 0,914 | * * * |
| 2.11 | Assigning teachers tocommittees/teams/task forces/classes | -0,895 | 0,0001 | 0,761 | * * * | -0,315 | 0,1868 | | |
| 2.1 | Determining school goals and objectives | -0,893 | 0,0001 | 0,866 | * * * | -0,947 | 0,0001 | 1,343 | * * * |
| 2.25 | Evaluating yourteaching performance with oyour principal/Head of Department/leader | -0,893 | 0,0001 | 0,855 | * * * | -0,842 | 0,0041 | 0,753 | * * * |
| 2.17 | Inducting new teachers | -0,853 | 0,0001 | 0,758 | * * * | -0,789 | 0,0314 | 0,535 | * * |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2.2 | Determining plans to meet school goals | -0,793 | 0,0001 + | 0,740 | * * * | -0,789 | 0,0008 + | 0,923 | * * * |
| 2.8 | Determining school needs and the needs of your department/ committee/team | -0,774 | 0,0001 + | 0,664 | * * * | -0,833 | 0,0003 + | 1,061 | * * * |
| 2.23 | Motivating teachers and pupils to carry out school objectives and plans | -0,689 | 0,0001 + | 0,727 | * * * | -0,736 | 0,0017 + | 0,845 | * * * |
| 2.13 | Coordinating the work of teachers sharing some subject/grade/ standard/committee/team | -0,681 | 0,0001 + | 0,635 | * * * | -0,842 | 0,0003 + | 1,009 | * * * |
| 2.21 | Guiding teachers sharing your subject/department/team | -0,646 | 0,0001 + | 0,661 | * * * | -0,789 | 0,0037 + | 0,765 | * * * |
| 2.6 | Setting standards for amount of written work and tasks | -0,607 | 0,0001 + | 0,585 | * * | -0,789 | 0,0093 + | 0,667 | * * * |

+ Statistically significant at 0,05 X = Mean score
* Effect size: 0,35 - medium effect ** p = p-value; d = d-value
0,6 = great effect ***

## TABLE 3: ITEMS SHOWING LOW DEPRIVATION

| | | Teachers | | | | Principals | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Item** | **Management activities** | **x** | **p** | **d** | | **x** | **p** | **d** | |
| 2.29 | Ensuring that school rules are obeyed | -0,595 | 0,0001 | 0,585 | * * | -0,578 | 0,0019 | 0,835 | * * * |
| 2.28 | Dealing with and resolving unrest situations | -0,589 | 0,0001 | 0,564 | * * | -0,578 | 0,0447 | 0,494 | * * |
| 2.20 | Guiding pupils concerning their academic performance | -0,550 | 0,0001 | 0,668 | * * * | -0,789 | 0,0024 | 0,808 | * * * |
| 2.12 | Admitting and assigning pupils to classes | -0,511 | 0,0001 | 0,584 | * * | -0,315 | 0,0099 | 0,660 | * * * |

+ Statistically significant at 0,05 X = Mean score
* Effect size: 0,35 - medium effect ** p = p-value; d = d-value
0,6 = great effect ***